

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 35-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0091990 to Little et al. ("Little"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Little* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Claims 35-54. For example, *Little* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 35:

organizing a first subset of artifacts for display according to the first view, the first subset comprising a particular artifact, the first set organized by:

placing a plurality of folders in the first view, a folder representing a package used to organize the computer program design;

placing a plurality of notes in the first view, a note representing information used during the computer program design;

placing an arrow between folders representing cross-referenced packages;

placing a line between a note and a folder to which the note belongs.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 35 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 41, 47, 53, and 54 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 35-54.

Section 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,699,310 to Garloff et al. ("Garloff"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants point out that the specification need not include all the information for comprehending the meaning of all claims terms. The meaning of every term used in a claim should be apparent from the prior art or from the specification and drawings at the time the application is filed. MPEP § 2173.05(a). Applicants respectfully submit the following to aid the Examiner in comprehending the term “military theory.” The *American Heritage College Dictionary* (3rd ed., 1997) defines “military” as “Of, relating to, or characteristic of the members of the armed forces.” “Military theory” is theory pertaining to the military. In addition, Tables 2 and 4 of the Specification provide examples of rules for military theory.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Garloff* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in Claims 1-34. For example, *Garloff* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 1:

accessing a plurality of domain rules for a military theory, each domain rule being invariant, the plurality of domain rules generated according to one or more patterns of a command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) system;

displaying a plurality of business rules for the military theory, each business rule being variable, the plurality of business rules comprising one or more rules of engagement.

Garloff also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 21:

accessing a plurality of rules for a military theory;

accessing a plurality of legislated laws associated with the military theory;

identifying required rules according to the laws to separate a plurality of domain rules of the military theory from a plurality of business rules of the military theory, each domain rule being invariant, each business rule being variable.

For at least these reasons, independent Claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 7, 13, 19, 20, 25, 29, 33, and 34 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-34.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494
Date: November 26, 2007

Customer Number: 05073